

Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

**DRAFT**

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the final Office Action of August 3, 2000.

A Petition to Extend time to within the third extended month accompanies this response. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

5           The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy extended during the interview on January 31, 2001. During this interview, we discussed differences between the invention as set forth in claim 16 and the Goldman et al. patent. The Examiner had requested that we make some clarifying changes to the claims and had proposed some claim language. With this amendment, claim 16 has been revised to incorporate the  
10   discussed claim revisions, which should place the claim in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment is warranted since it places the application in condition for allowance.

          Claim 16 had previously recited that a method for printing involves printing first type of indicia using a repetitive printing process and then printing a second type  
15   of indicia using a variable printing process. The claim also stated that the variable printing process is "in registry with the repetitive printing" so as to form combinations of first indicia and second indicia. One advantage of such a printing method is that game pieces can be printed "in a manner that is not repetitive and that inhibits prediction of game outcome."

**DRAFT**

Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

The Examiner had rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,398,708 to Goldman et al. The Examiner believed that indicia 22, which includes indicia 24, 26, and 28, is variably printed while other indicia is printed using a repetitive process.

5           As explained during the interview and also in the prior response, Goldman has a continuous sheet of printed stock which is output from a web press and this stock is perforated into sheets 50 of cards and then individually sent to a computer-controlled printing process. Goldman does not perform both the variable printing and repetitive printing on these same web of game pieces.

10           As mentioned above, claim 16 states that the variable printing process is "in registry" with the repetitive printing. As part of the Examiner's suggestion to clarify the claim, claim 16 has been amended to state that the method comprises "printing . . . using a repetitive printing process, "printing . . . using a variable printing process," and "registering the variable printing process with the repetitive printing." While the  
15           claim previously recited that the variable printing and repetitive printing were in registry, the claim now clearly states that the method involves "registering" the two printing processes.

          Another clarification requested by the Examiner was to specify that the repetitive printing process and variable printing process were part of the same method  
20           involving the same web. Claim 16 has therefore been amended to state that the

Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

**DRAFT**

printing using a repetitive printing process is "with a combination press" and that the printing of the second type of indicia using a variable printing process is "with the same combination press." In contrast, Goldman separates the web of material that has been printed with a repetitive process into a plurality of sheets and then each of these  
5 sheets goes to a second printer for the variable imaging.

Support for the changes in the claims can be found in various places throughout the application. For instance, with reference to page 9, the invention is described as printing complicated patterns requiring high resolution with "offset lithographic or other high quality, high speed printing, and then printing over and *in*  
10 *registry* with the resulting printed matter using a continuously variable printing technique, such as ink jet printing" (emphasis added). Page 11, lines 24 to 28, also refers to "using both a fixed repeat method (i.e., rotary offset or flexographic printing) as well as a continuously variable printing method, such as ink jet printing." Also, the discussion of Figure 7, which may be found on pages 24 to 26, refers to printing  
15 categorical information with "rotary offset lithography" and conditional information using a variable printing method, such as "ink jet printing." Page 26, lines 5 to 6, explains that the method results in "the variable printing being in registry with the repetitive printing." The changes to the claims therefore do not introduce any new matter.

Serial No. 09/339,698  
Docket No. D1005/192221

**DRAFT**

For at least the above reasons, claims 16 to 23 are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner intends to issue anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining matters.

5 Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Order  
Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoff L. Sutcliffe  
Reg. No. 36,348

OF COUNSEL:  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530  
404-815-6530  
Attorney Docket No.: D1005/192221